

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES MANALISAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOYDINE HALL, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 22-cv-04701-VC

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH  
PREJUDICE**

Re: Dkt. No. 20

The Amended Complaint is dismissed because it is frivolous and fails to state claims on which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Dismissal is with prejudice because further amendment would be futile.

The first five claims asserted in the Amended Complaint vaguely allege that various administrative actors have violated Manalisay's Due Process and Fourth Amendment rights over the course of his child-support proceedings. These allegations are nearly impenetrable. But to the extent that Manalisay's position can be discerned, it appears that he takes issue generally with the notion of administrative law judges. And he does not recognize the validity of state court orders, which he characterizes instead as "contracts" to which he never assented and by which he is therefore not bound. These allegations do not state a plausible Due Process claim. Manalisay's allegations against Department of Child Support Services agents—who, pursuant to court orders, levied his bank accounts, IRA accounts, and COVID-19 stimulus checks—fare no better at stating a plausible Fourth Amendment claim for unlawful seizure.

Manalisay's sixth claim—for bank fraud against Karen Santana—does not state a legally cognizable theory; there is no indication that this criminal statute creates a private right of action.

*See* 18 U.S.C. § 1344; *Gonzaga University v. Doe*, 536 U.S. 273, 286 (2002).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 20, 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'V. Chhabria', is positioned above a horizontal line.

VINCE CHHABRIA  
United States District Judge